RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 Attorney Docket No.: Q66362

Appln. No.: 09/961,206

## <u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 1-23 are all the claims pending in the application. Claim 19 stands allowed.

Claims 1-18 and 20-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,782,033) in view of Kaneko (U.S. Patent No. 5,236,147). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness the Examiner must show that the prior art references, when combined, teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. *See MPEP § 2143*. Applicant respectfully submits that the references cited above by the Examiner fail to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations as set forth in the present application. Specifically, the references fail to teach or suggest that "said information device includes a display which simultaneously displays said fishfinder information and the measured line length."

The Examiner acknowledges that Park fails to teach "the use of a revolutions counter and a line measurement device." See office action, page 3. Thus, Park fails to teach or suggest simultaneously displaying the fishfinder information and measured line length because Park does not even measure or have capability to measure the line length. To teach the claimed revolutions counter and line measurement device, the Examiner relies on the teachings of Kaneko. However, Kaneko fails to teach or suggest simultaneously displaying the measured line length and the fishfinder information. Therefore, even if the fishing reel of Park is modified to include the line measurement device of Kaneko, the modified display would not simultaneously display the fishfinder information and the measured line length since neither Park nor Kaneko teach or suggest to simultaneously display the fishfinder information and the measured line length.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

Appln. No.: 09/961,206

Attorney Docket No.: Q66362

Therefore, Applicant submits that the proposed combination would still fail to teach or suggest

each and every limitation of claims 1-18 and 20-23.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims

1-18 and 20-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Registration No. 48,071

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

Telephone: (202) 293-7060

Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 19, 2004

-3-